



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,364	07/05/2001	Paul D. van Poelje	030727.0037.CIP1	7049
36183	7590	02/17/2004	EXAMINER	
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP P.O. BOX 919092 SAN DIEGO, CA 92191-9092			JIANG, SHAOJIA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/900,364	Applicant(s) VAN POELJE ET AL.	
	Examiner Shaojia A Jiang	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-114 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-10, 19 and 46-114 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 11-18, and 20-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/21/03, 3/24/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's claim for domestic priority to provisional applications Serial No. 60/216/531 and 60/215,126 under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of the invention of Group I, claims 1-45 drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one insulin secretagogue and at least one FBPase inhibitor herein, and the invention of the species of particular FBPase inhibitor in the specification and glyburide as insulin secretagogue, submitted November 14, 2003 is acknowledged.

On consideration by the examiner, the specie election requirement for one FBPase inhibitor herein is modified to include all compounds of Formula I and IA, as a single specie, elected by Applicant November 14, 2003.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that Group I, II, III, and IV are not patentable distinct. This is not found persuasive because Inventions Group I and III; and Group II and IV are unrelated to each other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, Inventions Group I and III are drawn to two separate and distinct compositions, as Applicant admits in the specification (see page 5), insulin secretagogue is separate and distinct from insulin or insulin analogue. Therefore, they have different modes of operation. Inventions Group II and IV are drawn to two separate

Art Unit: 1617

and distinct methods because of two separate and distinct employing compositions.

Therefore, they have different modes of operation. See the Requirement for Restriction
page 3

Inventions Group I and II; and Group III and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). Therefore, the criteria for distinct inventions: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product. In the instant case, for example, insulin secretagogue alone or one FBPase inhibitor herein alone (another materially different product from the instant claimed combination) may be used in a method of treating a mammal having diabetes.

Note regarding the classification of the inventions herein that the search is not limited to the patent files.

As noted in MPEP § 804.01 (see below).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to

Art Unit: 1617

be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 46-114 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claims 6-10, and 19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected species.

The claims have been examined insofar as they read on the elected specie.

Claims 1-5, 11-18, and 20-45 are examined on the merits herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 1-5, 11-18, and 20-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for scope of enablement because the specification, while being enabling for the particular compound for driving blood flow to the penis, the particular compounds having the particular formula herein as FBPase inhibitor in combination with glyburide and other particular agents as insulin secretagogue, employed in composition herein, does not reasonably provide enablement for co-administering any compounds represented by a FBPase inhibitor and an insulin secretagogue recited in the claims herein.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to fully practice the instant invention without ***undue experimentation***. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

(1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

The nature of the invention: The instant invention pertains to a pharmaceutical composition for treating diabetes in a mammal.

The relative skill of those in the art: The relative skill of those in the art is high.

Art Unit: 1617

The breadth of the claims: The instant claims are deemed very broad since the instant claims read on any compounds represented by a FB Pase inhibitor and an insulin secretagogue employed in the composition herein.

The amount of direction or guidance presented:

Functional language at the point of novelty, as herein employed by Applicants, is admonished in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* 43 USPQ2d 1398 (CAFC, 1997) at 1406: stating this usage does “little more than outline goal appellants hope the recited invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate”. The CAFC further clearly states that “[A] written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name, of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials” at 1405(emphasis added), and that “It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus..” at 1406 (emphases added).

In the instant case, “represented by a FB Pase inhibitor” and “an insulin secretagogue”, recited in the instant claims are purely functional distinction. Hence, these functional recitations read on any compounds that might have the recited functions. However, the specification merely provides those particular compounds for each kind of functional compounds for the composition.

Art Unit: 1617

Thus, Applicants functional language at the points of novelty fails to meet the requirements set forth under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claims employing functional language at the exact point of novelty, such as Applicants', neither provide those elements required to practice the inventions, nor "inform the public during the life of the patent of the limited of monopoly asserted" (*General Electric Company v. Wabash Appliance Corporation et al.* 37 USPQ at 468 (US Supreme Court 1938)).

The predictability or unpredictability: the instant claimed invention is highly *unpredictable* as discussed below:

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art cannot fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus, by structure, formula, or chemical name, of the claimed subject matter, as discussed above in *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* Hence, in the absence of fully recognizing the identity of the members genus herein, one of skill in the art would be unable to fully predict possible physiological activities of any compounds having claimed functional properties in the pharmaceutical compositions herein.

Moreover, one of skill in the art would recognize that it is highly unpredictable in regard to therapeutic effects, side effects, and especially serious toxicity that may be generated by drug-drug interactions when and/or after administering to a mammal, the

Art Unit: 1617

combination of any compounds represented by a FBPase inhibitor and an insulin secretagogue, which may encompass more than a thousand compounds. See text book "Goodman & Gilman's The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics" regarding possible drug-drug interactions (9th ed, 1996) page 51 in particular. This book teaches that "The frequency of significant beneficial or adverse drug interactions is unknown" (see the bottom of the left column of page 51) and that "Recognition of beneficial effects and recognition of and prevention of adverse drug interactions require a thorough knowledge of the intended and possible effects of drugs that are prescribed" and that "The most important adverse drug-drug interactions occur with drugs that have serious toxicity and a low therapeutic index, such that relatively small changes in drug level can have significant adverse consequences" (see the right column of page 51) (emphases added). In the instant case, in the absence of fully recognizing the identity of the members genus herein, one of skill in the art would not be able to fully predict possible adverse drug-drug interactions occurring with many combinations of any compounds having claimed functional properties in the pharmaceutical compositions herein to be administered to a host. Thus, the teachings of the book clearly support that the instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable.

The presence or absence of working examples and the quantity of experimentation necessary:

As discussed above, only those particular compounds for each kind of functional compounds employed in the composition herein is disclosed in the specification. It is noted that only one particular combination of Compound J and glyburide, was tested

Art Unit: 1617

and is shown in Example X at page 315-316 of the specification. Thus, the evidence in the examples is also not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention and does not demonstrate criticality of a claimed range of the active agents or compounds in the claimed composition. See MPEP § 716.02(d).

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of any compounds having those functions recited in the instant claims. As a result, necessitating one of skill to perform an exhaustive search for the embodiments of any compounds having those functions recited in the instant claims suitable to practice the claimed invention.

Genentech, 108 F.3d at 1366, states that “a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion” and “[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable”.

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors, the case *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* (CAFC, 1997) and *In re Fisher* (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test all compounds encompassed in the instant claims and their combinations employed in the claimed compositions to be administered to a host, with no assurance of success.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1617

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The expression "M" in claim 11 renders claims 11 and 13 indefinite. The expression "M" is not understood since "M" is not defined in the formula I. Therefore, the scope of claims is indefinite as to the structural formula encompassed thereby.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 11-18, and 20-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasibhatla et al. (WO 98/39342, WO 98/39343, and WO 98/39344, PTO-892) and Melchior et al. (ANNALS OF PHARMACOTHERAPY, (1996 Feb) 30 (2) 158-64, PTO-892).

Kasibhatla et al. (WO 98/39342, WO 98/39343, and WO 98/39344) discloses that the instant particular compounds for example having the formula 1 in WO 98/39342, the formula 1 in WO 98/39343, and the formula 1 in WO 98/39344, being FBpase inhibitors at the AMP site, are useful in a composition and a method of treating diabetes in a

Art Unit: 1617

mammal. See WO 98/39342: abstract, page 1 lines 5-10, page 5-15-47 and claims 1-53; WO 98/39344: abstract, page 1 lines 5-10, page 6-36 and all claims therein; WO 98/39343: abstract, page 1 lines 5-10, page 6-75, and all claims therein.

Melchior et al. teaches that the particular insulin secretagogue, sulfonylureas such as glyburide, is well known to be useful in a composition and in the treatment of diabetes in a mammal. See the abstract in particular.

The prior art does not expressly disclose that the employment of the particular FBpase inhibitor of Kasibhatla et al. in combination with particular insulin secretagogue, sulfonylureas such as glyburide in a composition for the treatment of diabetes.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the particular FBpase inhibitor of Kasibhatla et al. in combination with particular insulin secretagogue, sulfonylureas such as glyburide in a composition for the treatment of diabetes.

One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to employ the particular FBpase inhibitor of Kasibhatla et al. in combination with particular insulin secretagogue, sulfonylureas such as glyburide in a composition for the treatment of diabetes since both the particular FBpase inhibitor of Kasibhatla et al., and particular insulin secretagogue, sulfonylureas such as glyburide are known to be useful in a composition and a method of treating diabetes in a mammal based on the prior art.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected that combining the particular FBpase inhibitor of Kasibhatla et al. in combination with

Art Unit: 1617

particular insulin secretagogue, sulfonylureas such as glyburide both known useful for the same purpose, i.e., treating diabetes, would improve the therapeutic effects for treating the same diseases, and/or would produce additive therapeutic effects in treating the same.

It has been held that it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for same purpose in order to form third composition that is to be used for very same purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art. See *In re Kerkhoven*, 205 USPQ 1069, CCPA 1980.

Thus the claimed invention as a whole is clearly prima facie obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5, 11-18, and 20-45 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over all claims of copending Application No. 09/470649.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application is drawn to COMBINATION OF FBPAASE INHIBITORS AND INSULIN SENSITIZERS FOR THE TREATMENT OF DIABETES.

The claim of the instant application is drawn to employ the same FBpase inhibitor in combination with insulin secretagogue, such as sulfonylureas, e.g., glyburide in a composition for the treatment of diabetes. Thus, the two compositions in the copending Application and the instant Application are seen to substantially overlap.

Thus, the instant claims 1-5, 11-18, and 20-45 are seen to be obvious over the all claims of copending Application No. 09/470649.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

In view of the rejections to the pending claims set forth above, no claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Jiang, whose telephone number is (571)272-0627. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 to 5:00.

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, Ph.D., can be reached on (571)272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-1235.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Anna Jiang', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

S. Anna Jiang, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner, AU 1617
February 4, 2004